

Dear MC Council Members:

I watched your meeting this week on the proposed vaccine passport legislation and totally support all of the individuals that testified who strongly opposed this proposed legislation, as well as the individuals representing various business organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce and Hispanic Organization that either opposed or had strong reservations about the proposed vaccine passport legislation. In this vein, I have the following questions for you.

- 1.) Where is your cost/benefit analysis for the proposed vaccine passport legislation? This proposed legislation would add significant costs to MC business, reduce the customer base thereby leading to reduced business and tax revenue, and result in business closures. Aggregate costs to business in MC would run into the tens of millions of dollars, if not more. It would also reduce the welfare of MC residents by denying them access to health clubs, restaurants, etc. Ironically, this denial of access to health clubs and other social activities actually worsens the aggregate health of the community as exercise and social interaction improves overall health of individuals.
- 2.) The CDC finally admitted, after the publication of their study, that natural immunity, obtained after contraction of Covid-19, is significantly stronger than the immunity conferred through the experimental vaccines. So how do you justify a vaccine passport that would prohibit MC residents who have had Covid from many social activities given that they have superior immunity compared to those who have been “vaccinated”? There can be no justification for such a policy. It is a ridiculous notion that these experimental vaccines, with the spike protein used as the antigen, would confer better immunity than the body having contact with the entire Covid virus. Please inform yourselves about basic immunology before considering major health policy legislation. Do your own homework, don’t just listen to a couple of county health officials who obviously are not seeing the entire picture, and are certainly not considering the total costs/benefits of this proposed legislation.
- 3.) As was stated at your vaccine passport meeting this week, the primary objective of the proposed legislation is to boost the vaccination rate among young people. In the opinion of many medical experts both here in the US and in Europe, there is no medical justification for vaccination among the youth. The risks of the vaccine (e.g., myocarditis) far outweigh any potential benefits. Hence, your primary objective cannot be defended on medical grounds. Therefore how do you justify the imposition of this proposed legislation? It is also worth noting that those who have forced these experimental vaccines on the youth could be held responsible for adverse health effects that they may incur over the course of their lives, for example, it is against the Geneva Convention, for which the US is a signatory, that a society cannot force an experimental medical intervention on a citizen without full informed consent of that person. Please note it is impossible to give full informed consent when the pharmaceutical industry has locked up the results of their vaccine trials for many decades and the media and much

- of the medical community has censored objective discussion of the costs and benefits of these experimental vaccines. It would be wise to ponder this.
- 4.) Councilwoman Navarro asked Dr. Stoddard if any less restrictive measures had been considered to mitigate the spread of the Omicron variant. The doctor obfuscated the question saying that he landed on the vaccine passport proposal instead of considering more stringent action such as business closures and shutdowns. No one on the council challenged this answer. It is your job to challenge answers such as this to important questions. He did not answer the question about less restrictive measures but instead framed vaccine passports as less restrictive than shutdowns. This was not the question asked, which was a very relevant question. Given his performance and this proposed legislation that he and others have drafted, I believe he is sorely out of touch with effective public health policies.
 - 5.) Councilman Jawando, quoting the French Premier Macron that the reason for the vaccine passports is to “piss off the unvaccinated”, reached the nadir of the meeting. I cannot help to think that this notion is indeed in the minds of some of you council members. This is beneath the integrity of your office and is a good reason you should consider resigning the office.
 - 6.) I note that various large American companies, e.g., Starbucks, have dropped their vaccine requirements for employees. Also, Britain, the Czech Republic and other countries are dropping their vaccine mandates, vaccine passports, and masking requirements as Omicron disappears from their shores. By the time you would get this horrible public policy implemented, Omicron will have left our shores as well. You can’t be so obtuse so as not to see this.

I would be highly appreciative of your responses to these questions.

Sincerely,

Arthur Wiese